DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 051 SP 040 643

AUTHOR Riggs, Iris M.; Sandlin, Ruth A.
TITLE Accountability for Teacher Education through Participation in Teacher Induction.
PUB DATE 2002-00-00
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (54th, New York, NY, February 23-36, 2002).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; *Beginning Teacher Induction; Beginning Teachers; College School Cooperation; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This paper examines whether institutions of higher education (IHEs) should be involved in collaborative induction efforts and whether such involvement would increase the accountability of IHEs' teacher preparation programs. It describes one California teacher preparation program's efforts. The program has maintained its active involvement within a state-funded induction program over 7 years. The IHE role within this induction program has included collaboration with county offices of education for development of the overall program design, creation of curriculum and instructional plans for new and mentor teacher seminars, delivery of seminar instruction, and program evaluation. The paper highlights issues related to financial support and faculty evaluation. It concludes that the most desirable role for university-based teacher educators is a place at the policy and development level. Their collaboration with K-12 partners can result in strengthened induction and forge linkages resulting in improved accountability. Benefits of participation in induction programs to teacher education include: teacher educators gain access to and knowledge of new teacher performance, collaboration with K-12 partners provides a constant communication link, and teacher preparation programs have easy access to knowledge of district, county, or state policies that have potential impacts on initial teacher preparation. (Contains 12 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Ruth A. Sandlin

2A

ED 464 051

Accountability for Teacher Education Through Participation in Teacher Induction

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
February 23-26, 2002
New York

Iris M. Riggs and Ruth A. Sandlin
California State University, San Bernardino

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP040643

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Accountability for Teacher Education Through Participation in Teacher Induction

Problem and Related Literature

While support for new teachers has been a topic of interest for quite some time (Huling-Austin, 1990; Lortie, 1975), recent politics have increased the development of formalized new teacher induction programs (California Commission on Teaching Credentialing, 1998; Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board 1998). In fact, twenty-eight states and the District of Columbia have implemented some form of new teacher support (Hirsch, E., Koppich, J. E., & Knapp, M. S., 1998). It is not clear, however, whether these efforts have been a collaborative among P-12 schools or county offices of education, and teacher preparation programs.

In some cases, induction has been linked to licensure requirements. For example, California's new teachers now need to complete two years of a formative assessment-based induction program in order to attain their Level II Credential (Olebe, Jackson, and Danielson, 1999). California does require these induction programs to be jointly sponsored by districts, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE's) and sometimes County Offices of Education. It is probably true, nonetheless, that even in states like California, where proposals for state support of induction include a goal related to collaboration, the collaboration is not defined.

Programs of teacher preparation are certainly being encouraged to consider involvement within induction programs. Induction could be one means for teacher education programs to gain more accountability for the teachers they educate. The focus then, for this paper, is the following:

- Should IHEs be involved in collaborative induction efforts and would such involvement increase the accountability of the IHE's teacher preparation program?

This paper will describe one California teacher preparation program's answers. This program has maintained its active involvement within a state-funded induction program over the course of seven years. The IHE role within this particular induction program has included collaboration with county offices of education for development of the overall program design, creation of curriculum and instructional plans for new and mentor teacher seminars, delivery of seminar instruction, and program evaluation. While no course work has been attached to induction, the benefits realized through this investment have encouraged the university's sustained level of commitment, resulting in partial release of ten tenure track faculty members for work within induction and within additional alternative credential programs that have resulted from the collaboration.

The Riverside, Inyo, Mono, and San Bernardino Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (RIMS-BTSA), formerly known as the Inland Empire Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (IE-BTSA), was initially funded in 1994 by the California State Department and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. IE-BTSA was one of thirty pilot research projects that utilized teacher assessment along with support to help beginning teachers in their first two years of induction. Within the first year, IE-BTSA served 190 beginning teachers in 17 school districts through the use of 55 mentors. Seven years later, during the 2000-2001 academic year, approximately 1600 beginning teachers and 750 mentors from 56 school districts were served in RIMS-BTSA.

The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) published in 1997, provided the theoretical underpinnings for the process of support and assessment in RIMS-BTSA. The California Formative Assessment System for Teachers (CFASST) designed by Educational Testing Services in 1998, was utilized as the assessment system within the program.

Riverside County Office of Education took the primary responsibility of directing the program with San Bernardino County Office providing training facilities and institutional guidance. Project teachers, proportionally assigned to each of the four involved counties, served as liaisons for the mentors and beginning teachers. Six

professors from California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), organized and delivered the educational seminars to both mentors and beginning teachers. University of California, Riverside, developed and managed the data analysis system.

As this collaboration began, the induction strand was a radical departure from the course work that the teacher preparation program had offered as part of the preliminary certification phase. An initial concern was why should teacher educators care to be engaged in induction of new teachers? Given the non-existent status of university course work and supervision within the induction of states such as California, it was be difficult to imagine a payoff for IHEs. Numerous questions arose:

- Financially, how can IHEs be involved, given the loss of faculty to programs void of university credits?
- How can university-based teacher preparation programs maintain their quality in the face of faculty release to induction?
- Is the university tenure and promotion process a deterrent to faculty involvement in induction?

CSUSB's teacher preparation program was able to answer these questions as the collaborative effort was initiated, developed, and sustained over the seven years.

Financial Issues

CSUSB faculty engagement in RIMS BTSA was supported by the grant's financial support of their partial release from teaching assignments. No faculty member was released more than 50% of their time to guarantee their continued involvement in campus teaching and responsibilities for advising and service. The release funds were utilized to employ full time lecturers or adjunct faculty to support the campus programs. In many cases, these replacement faculty were county or district employees who benefited the campus programs with their current practical knowledge of the field. In some cases, the RIMS/BTSA involvement facilitated the employment process due to the opportunities it provided for faculty to engage with K-12 colleagues.

An additional financial support included the county's willingness to allow the IHE to claim indirect costs on the release time funding. In other words, the money for faculty involvement was passed through to the university in one lump amount for campus distribution. This demonstrated a strong commitment to the level of collaboration as viewed by the county, thus enabling the College of Education Dean to more effectively advocate for the program. In fact, the faculty involvement included much more than simple consulting with the faculty serving on the governance team, developing curriculum, planning for program evaluation, and

helping to author project reports. Thus, the university was seen as warranting its own piece of the budget due to the extensive role its faculty play.

While in the short term, the university may appear to have weakened its own programs, in actuality, they have been strengthened over the long term. The partnership has positioned CSUSB faculty to interact with districts and their teachers in a meaningful, long-time relationship. The faculty have made important contacts for their programs, gained accurate knowledge of the context new teachers are facing, and provided more understanding to K-12 colleagues about the role and programs of the IHE.

Eventually, two additional funded partnerships spiraled from the original collaboration. The Pre-Intern program helps to prepare employed candidates to meet subject matter requirements, thereby preparing them to complete their credential requirements. The Intern program provides funded support for CSUSB's teacher intern programs which allow candidates to be employed as they complete credential requirements. Both programs engage CSUSB faculty and Project Teachers in grant implementation and evaluation efforts. District Liaison Meetings for these programs provide CSUSB faculty with easy access to district personnel in a way that surpasses the typical value of an advisory board. The county's lead in scheduling and

directing these meetings provides for excellent participation and improved communication.

Faculty Evaluation Issues

The dean's support of these efforts has been critical in establishing a faculty review process that recognizes the value of this type of work. Induction involvement must be publicly sanctioned and even lauded as within the mission of the college. The benefits of the partnership must be communicated by the dean not only to the faculty, but to higher administration.

Involved faculty must also take some responsibility for how they include induction work within their professional goals. Induction can either be viewed as a drain on their professional development or as a means to strengthen the area. Research opportunities are inherent when working with new teachers and their mentors. It benefits the faculty member to find a way to have their involvement critically reviewed through presentation and publication. Oftentimes, the faculty member can connect their own line of research with the induction context. For example, a reading faculty member can investigate reading in the context of induction and present or publish findings. Most IHE's expect that faculty have their professional work peer reviewed. If faculty involved within induction take the time to

incorporate their induction work within their line of research, they tend to meet the expectations of the campus evaluation processes.

Conclusions

While university-based teacher educators can play any number of roles within induction, the most desirable one includes a place at the policy and development level. As within the program cited here, teacher educators can have valuable input into the program design, funding proposals, governance, curriculum development, delivery, and evaluation of induction for new teachers. Their collaboration with K-12 partners can result in strengthened induction and also forge linkages resulting in improved accountability–thereby increasing the opportunity to further the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs.

The following lists of benefits to the teacher preparation program and challenges to be faced summarizes conclusions related to this report.

Benefits of Participation Within Induction to Teacher Education

- The university teacher educators gain access and knowledge of new teacher performance, including their own graduates. This enhances the ability of the teacher preparation program to collect and utilize data from the field for program improvement.

- Collaboration with K-12 school and county partners provides a constant link for communication. Stereotyped images each group has of the other fade as they all define themselves as teacher educators with a common purpose–induction.
- Linkages provide for easier access to K-12 colleagues for participation in university-based teacher preparation. For example, cooperating teachers, adjunct professors, teachers on assignment, resources for grant projects, and guest speakers can be more efficiently and effectively recruited due to the contacts made through induction.
- University teacher educators can more readily pursue opportunities for maintaining their involvement and service within K-12 classrooms due to induction connections.
- Teacher preparation programs have quicker knowledge of district, county or state policies that have potential impact on initial teacher preparation due to their participation in the induction arena.
- It is possible to develop a more seamless flow of teacher preparation from initial certification through advanced preparation. Collaboration at this level promotes the use of a common language related to teaching and learning. All constituents are more aware of what occurs at each stage of teacher preparation.

- Interactions with mentor teachers facilitates the university's ability to provide advanced certificate and masters programs to meet these teachers' needs.

Challenges to be Faced for Teacher Education Involvement Within Induction

- If course work is not a part of induction, financial support for faculty involvement can be problematic.
- Even if grant funds support the release of faculty, those funds typically do not provide for the hiring of full time faculty replacements. This can be costly to already stretched university-based teacher preparation programs.
- Since induction programs are typically directed by K-12 staff, faculty involvement may not be held in as high regard as other project opportunities in which faculty can take more active leadership positions.
- Retention and promotion policies and practices may not award faculty involvement in induction programs.

Contribution

Oftentimes, new teachers move into employment with the knowledge and skills they have developed only to face a reality that prompts their realization that additional learning is needed (Veenman, 1984). Retention rates are abysmal as in some states

over 40% of teachers leave the profession within their first five years of teaching (California Commission on Teaching Credentialing, 1992).

Induction appears to have an impact on retention (National Center for Research on Teaching and Learning, 1992). This quantitative evidence further feeds political support for the induction movement. The movement coincides with a movement to redefine teacher education as a continuum that spans the tenure of the teacher (Rosenholz, 1985; Holland, et., 1992; Clit, Veal, Holland, McCarthy, & Johnson, 1995). While one could argue that professional development is already in place for continued teacher learning, present professional development has typically been viewed as the sole responsibility of school district and county offices of education.

Induction provides an opportunity for teacher educators of the university to join with teacher educators of the field in efforts to support and further develop new teachers. Just as university teacher preparation programs are increasingly expected to engage with K-12 partners in the development and delivery of their programs, district-based induction programs should also include legitimate responsibilities for university partners. Ultimately, that role could benefit both K-12 partners and the IHE through the dialogue and data that result related to new teachers who have been prepared by the teacher preparation program. This may be the opportunity for continued access

to our graduates–not just through alumni surveys but through field contacts with them and their mentors.

This work advances the knowledge base of teacher education by identification of possible roles and responsibilities of university teacher educators within induction–a topic noticeably absent from induction literature.

References

California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (1992). *Success for beginning teachers: The California New Teacher Project.* Sacramento, California: Commission on Teacher Credentialing; California Department of Education.

California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (1998). *Support provider guidebook: Beginning teacher support and assessment/California formative assessment and support system for teachers: Field review version.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Clift, R. T., Veal, M. L., Holland, P., McCarthy, J., & Johnson, M., (1995). *Collaborative leadership and shared decision-making: Teachers, principals, and university professors.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hirsch, E., Koppich, J. E., & Knapp, M. S. (1998). *What states are doing to improve the quality of teaching: A brief review of current patterns and trends.* (Working Paper). Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Holland, P.E., Clift, R., & Veal, M.L. (1992). Linking pre-service and in-service supervision through professional inquiry. In Glickman, C.D. (Ed.), *Supervision in transition: The 1992 ASCD Yearbook.* Reston, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research in teacher education* (pp. 535-548). New York: Macmillan.

Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (1998). *Interns' perceptions of the Kentucky teacher internship program: 1997-98.* Frankfort, KY: Author.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

National Center for Research on Teaching and Learning (1992). *Findings on learning to teach*. Lansing: Michigan State University.

Olebe, M., Jackson, A., and Danielson, C. (1999). Investing in beginning teachers: The California model. *Educational Leadership, 56*, 41-44.

Rosenholz, S.J. (1985). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan, 66*, 349-355.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Education Research, 54*, 143-178

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Accountability for Teacher Education Through Participation in Teacher Induction

Author(s): Iris M. Riggs and Ruth A. Sandlin

Corporate Source: California State University, San Bernardino
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Publication Date: Feb 24, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Ruth A. Sandlin	Printed Name/Position/Title: Ruth A Sandlin - Professor
Organization/Address: CSUSB - 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407	Telephone: 909-880-5641 FAX: 909-880-7040
	E-Mail Address: rsandlin@csusb.edu Date: 3-19-02

CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHING
AND TEACHER EDUCATION

ERIC

November 1, 2001

Dear AACTE Presenter:

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a copy of your paper presented at AACTE's 54th Annual Meeting (New York, NY, February 23-26, 2002). Abstracts of documents that are accepted by ERIC appear in the print volume, *Resources in Education* (RIE), and are available through computers in both on-line and CD/ROM versions. The ERIC database is accessed worldwide and is used by teachers, administrators, researchers, students, policymakers, and others with an interest in education.

AACTE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Inclusion of your work provides you with a permanent archive and contributes to the overall development of materials in ERIC. The full text of your contribution will be accessible through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries throughout the country and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Documents are reviewed and accepted based on their contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

To disseminate your work through ERIC, you need to fill out and sign the **Reproduction Release Form** located on the back of this form and include it with a letter-quality copy of your paper. You can mail the materials to: **The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, 1307 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20005.** Please feel free to photocopy the release form for future or additional submissions.

Should you have further questions, please contact me at 1-800-822-9229; or E-mail: lkelly@aacte.org.

Sincerely,

Linda M. Kelly
Acquisitions and Outreach Coordinator